DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 133 670 CG 011 053

AUTHOR Shoenberg, Robert
TITLE Academic Advisement at the University of Maryland. Introduction.
PUB DATE [76]
NOTE 4p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Personnel and Guidance Association (Chicago, Illinois, April 11-14, 1976); For related documents, see CG 010 970-973

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Students; *Counseling Programs; Developmental Guidance; Educational Counseling; Higher Education; *Humanistic Education; Program Descriptions; Speeches; *Student Development; *Student Needs; *Student Personnel Services

ABSTRACT

The University of Maryland, College Park, advising system, developed in response to the 1972 Report of the Campus Senate Committee on Academic Advising, is described. The approach adopted is humanistic and developmental, and all efforts are made to make the institution more aware of and receptive to student needs. (KS)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

ED133670

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

# Academic Advisement at the University of Maryland

## INTRODUCTION

Dr. Robert Shoenberg

At the University of Maryland, College Park, we try to take academic advising seriously. I have to say that, because as Dean for Undergraduate Studies, I am responsible for seeing that advising goes along as well as possible on all levels, though each academic unit assumes direct responsibility for advising its own students.

The blueprint for our advising system is a 1972 report of our Campus Senate Committee on Academic Advising. Instead of voicing collective laments about the sorry state of what was then in the main a rubber-stamp function and instead of aggrieved fingerpointing, the report officially acknowledged 1) that advising involves life-planning as well as information-giving; 2) that the total campus commitment to "good" advising must involve personpower and money and rewards and visible lines of responsibility, not ritualistic statements of concern in the campus newspaper and catalogs; 3) that the quality of the advising system, not a requirement to be advised, should attract advisee to advisor--required advising, therefore, was officially abolished; 4) that the buck for selecting, training, and evaluating advisors should stop in a single, clearly designated office; and 5) that advisors could come in many forms other than faculty and staff, some of these to include students and computers.

We have moved a good way toward making these principles operational and toward elaborating theories of advising within which to operate. Our presentations today touch on both the techniques and systems we have found useful and on some theoretical considerations we find apposite. Neither theory nor practice is, in our case, prior to the other. Rather, they

CG011053

have grown up together.

Our general theoretical biases are no doubt familiar to you who are specialists in student development in higher education. We see our work as requiring a humanistic approach to understanding impacts on and changes in college students; a view of the student as progressing through a series of stages during the college years; and collaboration in the efforts of faculty, staff, students, and administrators in making the institution more aware of and more receptive to student needs. Student development models tend to emphasize one or another of these factors, but all suggest the need for a better integration of the "academic" and "student personnel" resources of the institution. The most comprehensive student development model, which combines the humanistic, stage theory and collaborative elements and maximizes the integration of resources, is that of the ACPA T.H.E. Project; I refer you to the July 1975 issue of the Journal of College Student Personnel for a complete presentation of this model.

We see in our advising system at least the potential - if not the actuality - of an operational process that allows and encourages this integrated developmental effort. While the seminal report had in mind teaching faculty members doing the bulk of the advising, in actuality many advising roles have been assumed by people whose primary training has been in counseling and student personnel work. Thus, our advising system provides a suggestive model for the integration of the academic and student personnel resources of the institution. It is a true collaborative effort of students, faculty and administrators focusing on the development of the student throughout the college years.

The five people you see here are all deeply involved in academic advising. Ms. Cathy Schwob, our recorder, has served as a student

advisor during both her undergraduate and graduate years and is currently completing a master's thesis dealing with the advising of transfer students. Our first presenter, Dr. Joseph Metz, is Assistant Dean for Undergraduate Studies. As such, he has responsibility for supervision of the campus advising network and for the direct advising of undecided students. Dr. Metz.